

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 10 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs.

In particular, the Examiner has indicated that the negative limitation in claim 1 of “the step of forming a solder resist pattern on the space portion is omitted by forming the oxidizing agent” is not supported in the specification as originally filed.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete this limitation.

Also, the Examiner has recommended an amendment to claim 1 which will overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection, which is directed to reciting that “the oxidizing agent is selectively coated to coat all parts of the space portion in which the distance between electrodes is smaller than 30μm.”

Page 5, lines 15-18 of the specification disclose that the space portion has a plurality of different dimension, and page 11, lines 19-20 disclose that protection film 16 (or oxidizing agent) is coated to the space portion of 30μm or less).

It is obvious that the phrase “the space portion whose width is smaller than 30μm” indicates the space portions of all width values that are smaller than 30μm (the width of the space portions exceeds 0μm and is 30μm or less).

Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite this feature, and the 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraph, rejections should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has maintained from the previous Office Action the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 10 as unpatentable over Lin et al. in view of APA, EP ‘623 and Miller.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


The Examiner has indicated that the limitation "in order to prevent short circuits" is merely "intended use" and carries no patentable weight. Furthermore, it appears that the Examiner has admitted that the combination of prior art references teaches that the oxidizing agent is selectively coated in space portion smaller than 30 microns, but not that all such space portions are coated with it. Thus, it appears that the Examiner's suggested amendment should also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection. Accordingly, as noted above, claim 1 has been so amended and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 10, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: March 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William L. Brooks

Registration No.: 34,129
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(202) 478-7370
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant